

# SPEAKER TROUBLED BY PARTISAN BEHAVIOR IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I just want to make one comment.

I do not intend to debate my colleague from California, but I would ask every Member of the House who just watched this colloquy to go back in your memory, as I did when I was a young teacher at West Georgia College, to remember what it was like to sit mesmerized watching the Watergate hearings and to see Senator Howard Baker not ask that they go back and investigate Lyndon Johnson; not ask that they go back and find a Democrat; not ask that they have this excuse, that excuse, the next excuse; not say, "Don't go after the little guys because you have to go after the big guys; you can't go after the big guys because you didn't go after the little guys;" not give 25 different, phony excuses.

Howard Baker set the standard for this country of a bipartisan, serious effort at getting at the truth. Howard Baker understood that Richard Nixon could not be allowed to take the entire Republican Party and the Constitution down in flames and that his job as a United States Senator was to get at the truth, and Howard Baker again and again and again cooperated with the Democrat Chairman Sam Ervin.

And I would simply ask every one of my colleagues: Look at what you just heard from the ranking Democrat, go back in your memory and remember Howard Baker's effort to find the truth, and then I think you will understand why we are being forced inch by inch to break through the stonewall and the cover-up despite the defense attorney tactics being used by Democrats who ought to be ashamed of it and ought to be helping us get at the truth rather than finding some flimsy excuse to avoid voting for immunity.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## PARTISAN BEHAVIOR IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I am sorry the Speaker would not yield to me because I wanted to tell the Speaker that in the Watergate investigation

the Chairman, Sam Ervin, did not accuse the President of the United States of being a scum bag. He did not say that he was out to get him. Those were the very words of the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in remarks in his district when he talked about what he was doing in this investigation.

Are we stonewalling an investigation that is proper and legitimate and is trying to get to the truth under a chairman who is interested in objectivity and facts? The chairman of our committee has acted from the very beginning in the most partisan of manners. He has refused to give us the basic rights to request subpoenas to look at Republican abuses. He has refused to allow the Democrats to play a role. In fact, he does not even let his own members play a role. They delegated authority to him, and he, in turn, has delegated it to his staff.

I might not be a Howard Baker, but the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DAN BURTON) is no Sam Ervin.

If we would have followed from the very beginning the requests that I made that we do a bipartisan, non-partisan, fair investigation on campaign finance abuses, we would not be here a year and a half later having spent \$6 million with a likelihood that at the end of this year we will have spent \$10 million harassing witnesses. And I have a long list of people who have been abused of people who have been hounded either the Republican staff did not know the right people they were going after or people they have gone after to the point of just plain harassment. We would not have that sort of thing.

We have had witnesses in our committee who have been called in for depositions over five times to be asked the same questions over and over again.

Today, we have a woman coming in for the fifth or sixth time; and she already was in depositions in the Senate three separate days and asked the same questions over and over again; and she had never been accused of any wrongdoing. Does anybody know what that means when a witness is brought in day after day after day to answer the same questions over and over again, sitting there with her, as she must, with her attorney to whom she is paying out of her own pocket on a government salary?

Now witnesses have been brought into depositions by the unilateral action of our chairman, and those witnesses have been asked questions that no one ought to be asked about their personal lives. But, as a practical matter, do you know what it means? It means that they can object and then the ruling would go to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DAN BURTON) as to whether they would be required to answer questions about their personal lives, their drug use or whatever, which has nothing to do with campaign finance abuse. And then the gentleman

from Indiana would rule they have to answer, and they could still refuse, and then they face a contempt of Congress.

Do you know what it is like for somebody to have the full force of the Federal Government, the Congress of the United States, staring at them and telling them they will be in contempt and may go to jail if they do not answer questions about their personal lives? So they answer it.

That is one area where people have been abused, but there is another area that I want to raise with my colleagues, and that is the action of the chairman to unilaterally release the tapes made of conversations that Web Hubbell had with his wife, with his children, with his friends when he was in this prison. He knew that the prison authorities were taping all conversations for security purposes, but he did not care about that because he was not talking about anything that breached security.

Ninety-nine percent of the tapes are conversations with his wife about the children, about their finances, about their sex life, about friends who may be in trouble whom they name, friends who may be having difficulties, the kinds of things that every person talks to a spouse about. And the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) has moved to release those tapes to the public.

It was bad enough that his staff was able to sit there in a very prurient manner and listen to those intimate conversations. I had asked my staff to do the same just so we knew what was on those tapes, and they were embarrassed having to listen to such personal conversations.

We have not had the conduct of a chairman who has acted properly, and we should not give him this authority to go any further.

## PARTISAN BEHAVIOR IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, since the beginning of this investigation, the White House and the Democrats on our committee have done everything they possibly can to obstruct our investigation.

Mr. Ruff, the President's counsel, told us initially he was not going to claim executive privilege; this was last January, and then he did. And then we had to move a contempt citation against the President's personal counsel because he would not give us documents that were relevant to the investigation. And, finally, at the last minute, 6 months later, he gave us a letter saying we are going to give you what you want. And then in June he sent me a letter saying, to the best of my knowledge, to the best of my knowledge, you have everything that you have asked for. Three months

later, we got 12 more boxes of documents, and then we found out about the White House videotapes.

Ever since this investigation has gone on, they have tried to drag it out and drag it out and drag it out to keep us from getting at the facts; and we have to deal with that. They drag it out, and then they blame us for taking so long. They keep information from us, and then they blame us for taking so long. They try to keep us from talking to witnesses that want to talk to us, and then they blame us for taking too long.

The four witnesses that he voted against last week for immunity have been approved for immunity by the President's Justice Department, and yet all 19 Democrats voted to obstruct our investigation by not allowing that immunity to take place, even though the President's own Attorney General okayed us getting that immunity, and that is because they are trying to protect this administration and block every single thing that we are trying to accomplish.

Now, they said we have not accomplished anything, that this has been a waste of the taxpayers' money and time.

Let me just go through a few things.

The Democrat National Committee has returned \$3 million in illegal foreign contributions that would not have been returned had it not been for the investigations that have taken place. Do we want the Chinese government giving campaign contributions to people running for president in this country? Do we want them to have influence over our foreign policy or our defense policy? I think not. And yet millions of dollars in illegal foreign contributions have come into this country to the DNC and to the President's legal defense fund and been returned, but only because of the investigation we caught him and we had to send it back.

We had White House coffees where they were raising money, where they were renting out the Lincoln bedroom, doing all kinds of things to try to raise money in addition to taking money from foreign sources.

The White House had people running in and out of there who were known drug dealers. Jorge Cabrera was in to meet with the President on a number of occasions. Wang Jun, a convicted drug dealer; Grigory Louchansky, another felon, had access to the President of the United States.

Charlie Trie, one of the President's best friends in Little Rock, was indicted. He fled the country, took the fifth amendment. He finally came back. We had to force that issue.

John Huang, a personal friend of the President who ran the Worthen Bank in Little Rock, Arkansas, a part of the Riady group. John Huang has taken the fifth, but we understand now he is willing to, with limited immunity, talk to us.

But the Democrats will not help us to get the immunity we need to have

these people talk, and why do they do that? Because they do not want those people to talk. They do not want the American people to know the fact about these illegal contributions and how foreign entities were buying influence in this government. They do not want the people to know that, because it is explosive and we are bent, hell bent, to get to the bottom of it and to get the facts out.

Because the American people have a right to know if their government is for sale, if their foreign policy is for sale, if their defense capability is for sale. And, if it is, those who are responsible need to be brought to justice, and that is what we are all about.

Now people, like my colleague from California, keep trying to defend their position. It is indefensible, and we are going to stay after until we get the facts out and get the truth out.

#### TAXPAYERS FORCED TO FUND PARTISAN INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRYCE of Ohio). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I yield to Mr. WAXMAN from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to make it very clear what has been happening in this investigation. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) has unlimited and unprecedented authority. He can unilaterally issue subpoenas, he can force people in for depositions, he can make people give up information, and then he can also disclose anything he wants to the press. His staff can leak it to the right press people to get the maximum story, and then get their spin on it. Democrats have never been in a position to stop their investigation, to hinder it in any way. They do not even ask us what to do, they just go ahead and do it. The only time we have any say on anything is when there is a question of immunity.

Now, we hear the Speaker and the chairman of the committee coming to the House floor to complain that we are stopping their investigation. Well, the fact of the matter is that after over a year and a half, they have asked, through depositions and otherwise, for information about Democratic campaign abuses, and they have received over 1 million and a half pages regarding Democrats. They have gone after Democrats, at taxpayers' expense, doing research for opposition campaign purposes. This is what this is all about. It is a government-funded Republican campaign to smear Democrats. It is not a legitimate investigation about campaign finance abuses.

These people, by the way, who are complaining today are the same ones who did not want us to have campaign finance reform even considered by the

House, until they were forced by some of their own Members to bring it up.

Madam Speaker, I want to point out that this Burton committee has been incompetent. They have blundered, these are not just my statements. I want to read the statements, a series of editorials from the New York Times. The New York Times called it a "parody of a reputable investigation", useless and unprofessional, and a "rogue operation". The Washington Post earlier last year already noted the "investigation runs the risk of becoming its own cartoon, a joke, and a deserved embarrassment". The Los Angeles Times called it a "partisan sideshow". The former chief counsel, the Republican chief counsel of the committee, quit last year, and he said, he was unable to conduct an investigation that complied with the standards of professional conduct that he had been accustomed to when he was in the U.S. Attorney's Office. He resigned because he said this whole investigation was incompetent and unprofessional.

Madam Speaker, they have blundered, they have handled it in a partisan way, they have handled it incompetently, and what do they do? They come to the House floor and want to point fingers. They want to blame everybody but themselves. They want to point a finger at the administration, they want to point a finger at me, they want to point a finger at the Democrats, for their incompetence and their blunders.

Oh, how I wish we really had a fair investigation. We pleaded with the Republicans, let us do a fair investigation. I even wrote an editorial in the New York Times, suggesting that if it helped, we ought to appoint some independent investigator to look at the Clinton administration issues, so we could then look at Democrats and Republicans in a fair way. We were told to forget it. They had the subpoena power, they had the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to spend; they were going to do what they want to do, and that is what they have been doing for the last year and a half. It has been a series of embarrassments for them, and now, to get out of that, they are saying that we should go along and help them with immunity.

They can send this investigation to another committee. They can go to the Committee on House Oversight chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) where they have stacked it so they have two-thirds of the vote, and they can vote immunity, and then Chairman THOMAS can do the investigation. Fine. If that is what the Republicans want to do, send it to another committee. It could not get any worse. It could not get any worse if they had somebody else trying to do this investigation.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), is just not the person for the job. We do not put somebody in to investigate